

NATO—European Defence Community

have forces. It is impossible for the Americans, the Canadians and other smaller countries to defend a great country like Germany from the powerful forces which we are told Russia could mobilize in a very short time. As the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) has said, there is no German army in existence today. There is really nothing for the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) to fear. What we have to fear is what everybody is fearing; that the Russians may feel they are in a position to attack and conquer. Fortunately the organization that has taken place in the last year or two under the leadership of General Eisenhower and the United Nations seems to have put them off that idea. Let us hope this protocol will be speedily ratified by all the nations so Germany will be reorganized and become part of the common defence of Europe and the western democracies as soon as possible.

Germany has made a remarkable recovery, similar to the recovery made by Japan. It is really remarkable to notice how these two countries have come up from defeat and the results of the severe bombing attacks they received, which practically destroyed a high percentage of their industrial capacity. German industry is now in such a position that people who attended the international trade fair in Toronto the other day were full of admiration for the German exhibit which they said was the best at the show.

What we have to decide today is whether we are going to support Germany entering into the European defence community and joining us in a defence contract against possible communist imperialist aggression. That is the problem in a nutshell, and it seems to me it is very simple. There is only one decision we can make. The hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart do not wish us to make the decision right away. They say let us wait; let us see what the other countries are going to do. Well, it is either right or wrong, and it seems to me to be right so the sooner we do it the better. Let us who claim credit for having initiated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and all the good things that have come from that organization, go ahead. Why should we hesitate to be the first to approve this protocol?

Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a brief word.

It seems to me this situation is terribly clear, terribly simple and terribly important. What is the situation? The situation as I see it is that we and other nations have banded ourselves together in the hope that we may still

have time to become strong enough to deter the Russians from attacking us. Now we are asked to take an action the aim of which I suppose, if you analyse it accurately, is to do the best we can to get Germany on our side rather than the other side. I suppose that if Germany is attacked today we are bound to defend her. We have troops in Germany; our own brigade is there.

Now, let us not fool ourselves that the Germans have come to love us. Of course they have not come to love us. The question is whether West Germany will find it in her interests to be on our side rather than the other side. We know that they hate communism, or we believe that they hate communism; nevertheless those who had to make this decision—Acheson, Eden, and Schuman—did not find it easy, I am sure. They found it terribly difficult, and I think all the evidence shows that. Nevertheless, having calculated the risk these men—able men whom we trust—with all the information available decided to take the course which has been decided upon.

We are now asked to authorize our government to go ahead. We are not asking it to rush in tomorrow, but I deprecate more than I can say the idea that we should hang back and let the European countries go first. Where would we be if the United States had done that for the last year or two?

As I said, I do not think we should tell the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) that he should rush off and mail this protocol today or do whatever is necessary by way of depositing it, but it seems to me most unfortunate that anything should be said in this house which can be used to show there is hesitation. We are committed now, and the time for hesitation has long gone by as far as I can see. It would seem to me unfortunate beyond words if anything said in this country could be used, as it will be used in Russia, to show that our people are half-hearted, that they have been ready to talk but that when the issue comes they are not ready to act. That can be used in the German bundestag where this is being fought out at the moment.

I have, myself, the greatest admiration for Adenauer. I do not know whether he hates or loves us, but he is a stout fellow trying to get this thing through. He is not having an easy time. It seems to me that any word of hesitation in this house is going to be surely magnified and used by the opponents of this measure in the West German parliament. We are not acting in any spirit of chauvinism; we have had enough war, and we know what it is like. It is not a very thrilling